Appendix G - Comments and Responses

| | Comment | | |
|-----|-----------------------|---|---|
| No. | From | Comment | Response |
| 1 | Karen Huss, SMAQMD | Although the discussion on diesel particulate matter (DPM) is done well on page 35, the discussion to justify DPM emissions as less than significant should be expanded (pages 43 and 48). The SMAQMD made similar comments regarding DPM emissions in the Mormon Island Auxiliary Dam (MIAD) Modification Project EIS/EIR (State Clearinghouse #2009042077). Language from the MIAD FEIS/EIR (attached) is an example of an expanded significance determination discussion when a health risk assessment has not been conducted. Mitigation measures being implemented that reduce DPM should be added to the discussion as well. DPM is reduced when off-road construction equipment particulate exhaust emissions are required to be reduced by 45% (part of the standard SMAQMD construction mitigation measure). | Additional Language has been added to the report on significance criteria and mitigation measures for DPM. |
| 2 | Karen Huss, SMAQMD | The use of aqueous or emulsified diesel fuel as a NOx mitigation strategy has not been viable in the Sacramento region to date (page 50). | Clairifying text has been added to the document, |
| 3 | | On page 51, the "Mitigated Emissions Summary" indicates that "the 20 percent reduction in NOx applies only to on-site construction equipment and on-site haul trucks." Please clarify that the 20 percent NOx reduction in construction emissions suggested by the SMAQMD's standard construction mitigation measure only applies to off-road equipment not haul trucks designed for on-road use. It doesn't appear emissions calculation changes are necessary (Appendix D2). | Clairifying text has been added to the document. |
| 4 | Karen Huss, SMAQMD | The SMAQMD encourages the Army Corps of Engineers to estimate greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions that may result from implementing best management practices listed, especially the measures related to concrete production, the most GHG emissive process of this project (pages 61 and 62). | Due to the nature of the air quality analysis, based on estimated contractor schedule, equipment, and plan of construction, the Corps feels that an estimate of quantitative GHG emission reduction from the mitigation measures would be too speculative. The estimated CO ₂ emissions are below the 25,000 metric ton reporting threshold. |
| 5 | Karen Huss, SMAQMD | A CEQA significance finding for GHG emissions from the project is necessary in accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.4 (page 63). | Text for CEQA level of significance has been added to the document. |
| 6 | Karen Huss, SMAQMD | Appendix D2, Air Quality Emissions Calculations, shows the use of electric stationary cranes and man lifts. If electricity to power this equipment is generated by diesel generators, those emissions should be included in the emissions calculations. It is not clear if line power will be used. | Clairifying text has been added to the document. |
| 7 | Karen Huss, SMAQMD | Appendix D2 also shows maximum NOx emissions of 34.68 tons/year for the Control Structure and 44.54 tons/year for the Chute and Stilling Basin construction. These calculations are not consistent with Tables 3-9 and 3-11 in chapter 3.3.1. | The Appendix has been updated with the correct calculatios. |
| 8 | Karen Huss, SMAQMD | SMAQMD rules apply to all projects at the time of construction. A list of the most common rules that apply to construction is attached. A complete list of all SMAQMD rules is available at www.airqualtiy.org or by calling 916-874-4800. | Comment Noted. |